



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,541	02/27/2002	Tatsuya Haga	31671-176438	1435
26694	7590	10/16/2006	EXAMINER	
VENABLE LLP P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			BRANNOCK, MICHAEL T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1649	

DATE MAILED: 10/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/069,541	HAGA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Brannock	1649	

All Participants:

(1) Michael Brannock.

(2) Ann Hobbs.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 October 2006

Time: 1:00

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

na

Claims discussed:

102 and 109-112

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated that the application would probably begin interference proceedings and that claims 102 and 109-112 would not correspond to the proposed count. Thus, claims 102 and 109-112 should be canceled and presented in a divisional application. Applicant's representative stated that she would discuss the situation with her clients. .